1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
4	Plaintiff,			
5	v. Docket No. 17-161			
6	San Juan, Puerto Rico JAMES FRANCIS GORMAN, October 31, 2018			
7	Defendant.			
8				
9	REVOCATION HEARING			
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE AIDA M. DELGADO COLON,			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.			
12				
13	APPEARANCES:			
14	For the Government: Ms. Elba Gorbea Padro, AUSA			
15				
16	For the Defendant: Mr. Jesus Hernandez Garcia, AFPD			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Proceedings recorded by stenography. Transcript produced by CAT.			
ı				

1		I N D E X	
2	WITNESSES:		PAGE
3	None offered.		
4			
5	EXHIBITS:		
6	None offered.		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

San Juan, Puerto Rico 1 October 31, 2018 2 3 At or about 1:54 PM 4 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal case 17-161, United 5 6 States of America versus James Francis Gorman. Case called 7 for revocation of supervised release. Appearing on behalf of the United States, Assistant U.S. Attorney Elba Gorbea. 8 Appearing on behalf of the defendant, Assistant Federal Public 9 Defender Jesus Hernandez. 10 The defendant is present in court and will not 11 12 require the services of the court interpreter. MS. GORBEA PADRO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. AUSA 13 Gorbea on behalf of the United States. The government is 14 ready to proceed. 15 MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 16 Jesus Hernandez on behalf of Mr. James Gorman. We're also 17 18 ready to proceed. 19 THE COURT: Okay. So we are here for a final 20 revocation in essence. There are several motions in the case 21 filed at docket 55, in June of 2018. Technically, the probation officer reported that on 22 23 June the 1st of 2018, the defendant had to relocate from his residence allegedly due to fear of being attacked by a former 24 employee. He did so against the advice -- in essence, that he 25

reported via e-mail he was on the move and unable to stay in one place, but he failed to report the address he was staying. And the probation officer reports this to -- the violation of the conditions of release, and also a SORNA violation of course because of the registration requirement.

Then on June the 1st of 2018, he was scheduled to report to the office no later than 5:30 PM. He failed to report.

There's a subsequent notification filed by the probation officer, and it's at docket 61. In essence, there's information, of course, that on June 12 of 2018, he was instructed to report to the Probation Office the following day. And he was instructed to provide the address where he was staying, but he declined to do it. And failed to report in violation of his conditions of supervised release that on 12-24-2014, the defendant was arrested in New York by the Marshal Service.

According to the report, at the time of arrest, he was in possession of a Social Security card under the name of Rolando Diaz Rodriguez, and had an ID with his picture with the name Yimmie Perez Diaz on it.

It's my understanding that no charges have been filed for those -- for that factual scenario, reason for which we are talking technical violations, of course with the failure to register being included.

There was a preliminary revocation hearing. Probable cause was determined as to all allegations of the probation officer. And it remains to be mentioned that the probation officer was extensively questioned at the hearing in which he testified.

So what is the position of this defendant at this juncture?

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Gorman, at this juncture, Your Honor, we will not be challenging the allegations in the motion. We will be arguing for mitigation.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Your Honor, a review of the PSR in this case will tell you what kind of person Mr. Gorman is. I think we have to understand who he is and his background to give context to his conduct in this case.

His conduct in this case, there's no controversy that he fled Puerto Rico because of death threats, Your Honor.

These death threats were communicated to the Probation Office, and I believe the Probation Office corroborated Mr. Gorman's version with his girlfriend, and also a police report that was filed.

So his fleeing from the country was because of credible death threats. Yes, it's a violation, Your Honor, but that's the context of his leaving the island.

Now, Mr. Gorman, Your Honor, when I reviewed the PSR, I noticed his upbringing. He hasn't had great parents. He moved around foster care. His grandparents turned him over to foster care when he was 15. He's moved around to different states growing up. He's been hospitalized because of mental illness, Your Honor, which includes bipolar disorder, PTSD, hyperactivity, major depression. And although some of these conditions do not exist currently, when you speak to Mr. Gorman, he does still battle some of these issues on a daily basis.

He's very functional. He does work. He was a fisherman most of his adult life, Your Honor. But he was also homeless a lot of periods of his life, Your Honor. In fact, when he was — in the PSR, page two, his address was homeless. And when he was arrested in New York in July of this year, he was actually arrested at a homeless shelter in New York. And that's because he doesn't have a family base to lean on, Your Honor.

He doesn't have any contact with his family members. And why would he? You know, these are members who abandoned him when he was growing up.

However, we have identified one gentleman in New York
City who is a lifelong friend, who is willing to provide his
residence as a permanent address where Mr. Gorman can live or
reside. And I think that's a big issue in this case, Your

Honor, because once Mr. Gorman is released, he has to go somewhere. He has to live somewhere.

Our solution would be to allow him to transfer to New York City, because in Puerto Rico, he has no family members. He's not from here. He grew up in the United States. He came down here in 2016 to work with FEMA, but there is no real connection to the island.

Excuse me, Your Honor. He came -- correction, Your Honor. He came down here as a fisherman in 2016. But there is no -- there is no --

THE COURT: So he came in 2016 as a fisherman or to work with FEMA?

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: As a fisherman, Your Honor, in 2016. And so he stayed. But there's no real connection to the island, Your Honor. If he was released today, he would have nowhere to go. He would be homeless again. There are no family members to lean on in the States except this friend that we have identified.

Actually, we've given the name of the person, the address and the phone number to the probation officer. We gave the information to him a couple months ago so he could corroborate the information we gave him.

The revocation proceeding has to be resolved in order to -- the proceedings in this case. He notified --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: He fled because he was under death threats, and this was communicated to his probation officer at the time via e-mail, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the probation officer gave him instructions what to do and how to report, and he failed to comply.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: That's true, Your Honor. But in the context of credible death threats in Puerto Rico, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Who was threatening him?

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Our information is an ex-associate.

THE COURT: Two employees that he had that he never paid salaries, if at all? If those were threats, maybe they were trying to claim their monies because the defendant never paid them -- and I'm not justifying the actions of these individuals, but what he calls threats could be collection actions by these individuals, not threats being made because your client -- as far as I know, from the probation officer, also received the help of another woman who worked in FEMA in California, and then he began using her and demanding money from her.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Your Honor, during his allocution, he's going to explain in detail. All I have is the information I read in the e-mail. But the concerns that

the Court has --

THE COURT: I can understand that. And right now your client is technically talking to you and telling you arguments and things to rephrase or to do. I don't know what instructions he's giving you, but in essence the information that I received from the probation officer talks about an individual that keeps manipulating those that even out of good will, this woman, having approached him and tried to help him. So this is a very different scenario.

And I'd rather have someone here that comes and tells me the truth than having someone who tries to manipulate the Court. And this is what I see from this defendant.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: One moment, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Give me two seconds.

(Discussion held off the record with the probation officer and the Court.)

THE COURT: I'll hear from you, Counsel.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor. In terms of the interpretation of what happened, I can only inform the Court what has been told to me of course, Your Honor. There was communication, however, and that's an important factor. Whether he followed the instructions, I think we're not challenging that violation, Your Honor.

And I know there was communication after he left the

island. He was brought back in late July, Your Honor. He's been detained since. And I just want to discuss the life he's been living behind bars so far at MDC, Your Honor.

There has been some issues with the food he's receiving. My client is Jewish, Your Honor. He does require a kosher meal. That wasn't being complied with. In fact, there were times he was given expired food. There were some instances where my client failed to eat as discrimination because of his religion. And we brought these issues to the attention of the legal department at MDC. He made strides to better his conditions there, but that's the way he's been living these past months at MDC, Your Honor.

So when you look at his background, Your Honor, which is in the PSR, that's a fact. And his conduct here, I think if a plan -- I'm not asking the Court to treat him preferentially, Your Honor, but you have to understand sometimes his conduct is a reaction based on his mental conditions, Your Honor.

However, I've spoken to Mr. Gorman since he's been in Puerto Rico. He does want to make a commitment to follow the conditions of supervision, Your Honor. His main concern, his main and his principal concern is to relocate to the United States, to the mainland, Your Honor, to serve his supervision over there and to continue fishing, because that's his main source of income, Your Honor.

Given the sort of facts, Your Honor, given his background, Your Honor, I think it's time -- for the violations he's committed, no -- incarceration would do no good for him, Your Honor. Our request would be to consider a sentence of time served, Your Honor. Consider moving him into the halfway house in Puerto Rico until a transfer or relocation can be done to the mainland, Your Honor. And that would be our request, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. There was a time after the defendant relocated in which he remained absconded until arrested in New York or found in New York.

Can the probation officer state, for purposes of the record, the information that you have gathered concerning whether this defendant ever filed a complaint for those threats that he alleges to have received and what is the information that you have been able to receive?

PROBATION OFFICER: Guillermo Arbona for the record.

The information that we have received is that personally Mr. Gorman did not file any complaints. However, we do know that his consensual partner, Ms. Maria Samoa, she filed a complaint, because allegedly two of the individuals that were threatening Mr. Gorman tried to ask for some money from her. And she decided to file the complaint.

But Mr. Gorman, he was in Puerto Rico. He did not report to the police or make any complaints regarding the

allegations, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Any evidence indicating that the threats against this defendant were real?

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, we spoke with the two individuals that allegedly tried to engage in violent conduct against Mr. Gorman, and both of them give us different versions of the situation. They say that Mr. Gorman was supposed to pay them money for the job they did working for him. That he was subcontracted by FEMA, but he failed to pay them. And they were trying to receive the money that they earned working for him.

And both assured not making any death threats against Mr. Gorman.

THE COURT: Okay. And the information about this woman who tried to help him and was the reason why he secured the job with FEMA, and that later on the defendant was attempting to get monies from her?

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. Initially she was willing to help Mr. Gorman, and she was doing so in addition to helping him get the job with FEMA. And -- but later she understood that Mr. Gorman was taking advantage of her by constantly asking for money from her, and it got to a point that she thought that Mr. Gorman was doing so to take advantage of her.

And she stopped sending him money because he was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

making also promises that he was going to report to Puerto Rico, that he was going to surrender, and that he was going to face the authorities, and asking money from her to pay for the air ticket. But he failed to comply and use the money for the things that he was promising her, so she stopped communicating with Mr. Gorman and she stopped sending him money. THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. PROBATION OFFICER: You're welcome. THE COURT: So addressing myself to the defendant. Sir, there's information on the record. Probable cause has been determined, and no other evidence to the contrary has been presented to the effect that you have violated the conditions of supervised release as alleged by the probation officer. So is there anything you'd like to state and that I should consider before sentencing you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. THE DEFENDANT: The two individuals that were working for me -- I started with HUD. And I got asked to move over to a program called Tu Hogar Renace. My position with HUD was to do inspections on foreclosed properties by the Federal Government. In the first few months -- if you can remember, at the beginning of the year, there were a lot of alleged

misconducts by a couple companies, of people going to houses, doing shabby work. My function with the company, the subcontracting company for FEMA, Patriot, was to go to the homes, inspect the homes, and to decide if the people should get paid for it.

Now, I have two of my own employees: One, Adrian Torres, and the other Shawn something. I don't remember at this time, Your Honor. I apologize. They went to a house in Ciales, Puerto Rico. They replaced the window, and then they took the window back down, took it back to Home Depot and turned the receipt in to Patriot.

And this was brought to my attention, so I went through all their receipts going back months. And in the process of going back, I discovered what they were doing is they would go to a home, they would do what they call a reorder, because anything by the government that was changed that was not by FEMA or Tu Hogar Renace, you have to do a reorder so the government can reimburse the company. They would do a reorder, pay out of pocket, take the stuff down, put the old stuff back up, and tell them they didn't qualify for it and take it back to Home Depot.

And it wasn't a lot of money. We're talking 40 dollars here, 20 dollars there. If you go to the place, I'm sure you're familiar with the island, Ciales, it's a hike and there's nothing up there. So they've been instructed to

install three smoke detectors, and they only have two that day. They go to the store, buy one, get an itemized receipt saying they bought this. Well, they're turning in receipts for universal remote controls. Everybody that I work under there, everybody's from the United States. They don't speak Spanish. They don't know anybody. My Spanish is getting better, and I go to these places.

I went to a spot in Bayamon across from Adrian Torres' house, where it says that he bought a universal remote. No. It's just because they didn't have it written down right. Well, I went in there and there is no remote anywhere. I made a decision not to pay them their full amount.

They received, both received sub amounts, plus loans, draws, a daily draw of cash out of my own personal pocket, because they were subcontracted, you know, at-will employees. You know, they're not subcontracted by the government.

They're subcontracted by me. I can terminate their employment at any time, and I told them that.

And I said -- you know, they make a lot of money. They get 600 dollars per house. All they're doing is going in and putting up a couple fire alarms, carbon monoxide detector, the windows, openers for the Miami windows. It's not a lot of stuff. The stuff they're putting up doesn't even cost the six hundred dollars, you know.

It's abuse, and I called them on it. And, you know, I contacted my probation officer in May about this, not June, because I did report this. I reported it to the police department, and they said, man, we really can't do anything unless the people want to press charges, which nobody really wanted to get involved in it. They just want their stuff fixed.

There was an instance where Shawn, his job was to deal with roofs. He went to a house in Ciales, to people who went four months in one room, and he washed their roof and then he sealed it the same day, right after the other. The whole house is ruined. Now you have to sand blast the roof.

And the Americans that are in charge of this are telling me, hey, why are you letting this team do this. You have to hold them accountable. If Matt Vargo (ph) was here from Patriot today, he would say the same thing.

There are a lot of instances where people are abusing people. You know, they didn't have anything. I didn't grow up with much. And I'm not going to say I paid them. I didn't pay them. The Court is absolutely right. I did not pay them one penny, nor would I today.

And I went to the United States. I spoke with the CEO in Texas, Matt Vargo, as well as the CEO here, and I told them, don't pay them. They go up to the house and talk to people. They went up to the house apparently months after

this happened. And they don't work anymore, as far as I know.

As far as Marie Samora (ph) goes -- you know, they threatened

my life.

When somebody threatens me, especially a place in Puerto Rico where it can be dangerous, and especially someone from the projects, I'm going to take it serious. And I contacted Mr. Guillermo Aborna in May. He wasn't here. He was in Spain. So the best thing I could do was I contacted my first agent, Nelson Mendoza. And I called him at eight o'clock at night and explained the situation. He said, you need to put it all in writing and send it to Mr. Aborna.

I didn't hear from them for days. It wasn't right away. This was days I didn't hear from them. It's not like I sent it on a Friday, you know. I didn't hear from them in days. And to be completely honest with the Court, by the time they contacted me, I was already gone. And it's just the truth. And I didn't know what to do.

I don't know a lot of people on this island, and I just -- I did wrong. And I understand that. I would just like the Court's understanding of the situation.

And I'm being open about the whole -- the Adrian

Torres thing. I mean, what's right is right. What's wrong is

wrong. And people don't have much on the island right now. I

mean, I met a lot of people with no roof at all --

THE COURT: That's not the issue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I know. I'm saying I have to take into account everybody, and I don't think somebody deserves to get paid if they're stealing, you know. THE COURT: I'm not getting involved in that. THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: You had mechanisms under the law to report a threat. There were other officers at the probation office if Mr. Aborna was not there. THE DEFENDANT: And I notified Nelson Mendoza. called him four times before he was able to answer. like seven, eight o'clock at night. You know what I'm saying? THE COURT: Okay. THE DEFENDANT: And I spoke with him and explained the situation. THE COURT: Okay. THE DEFENDANT: He said, write a letter in detail. Explain everything you just told me. And I did that. I believe we might have that here. I did the best -- I'm just not good with everything sometimes, and especially when somebody's threatening my life. Maria and I, I still talk to her every day. She came to see me the other day while she was here. I don't know where the -- I'm not going to speak on Mr. Aborna's version of the events, but I don't believe that's the way it was at all. She didn't pay for my ticket. I used a buddy pass to go to

the United States from a friend of mine from the United States.

And I never said that I was going to fly back to Puerto Rico.

In fact, Your Honor, I had spoken with my attorney, Laurie

Galafino (ph) in New York City, who has multiple times tried

to speak with probation. And -- if he's willing to plead

guilty up here, why can't we keep him in New York? He already

has an address here. He doesn't speak the language. He's

already here. He wants to stay in the States. Let's see if

we can facilitate that. And they said, absolutely not.

THE COURT: That your attorney doesn't speak what language?

THE DEFENDANT: That I don't speak Spanish completely. Spanish.

THE COURT: You can speak in English to the probation officer.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm talking about living in Puerto
Rico. I was already arrested, Your Honor. I was already at
MDC Brooklyn. So she communicated, if he's trying to relocate
here and stay here, let's start this process now when he's
here. And he wasn't trying to hear that.

And that wasn't just from him. I believe he received a couple calls from the U.S. Marshal Service, as well as other agencies. And, you know, I'm sorry. I can assure you that if

you let me go home, back to the United States, that I'll stay committed to doing the right thing.

I got a job 24 hours after I got out when I got to the island, and I didn't even have a place to live at. And within two weeks, I went from living in the place in Caguas to living in Isle Verde. And you know, I believe it speaks to a little bit of my -- I don't know what the word is -- dedication to try to do what's right. And more so, Your Honor, I wish for a living -- I live in the United States.

I'm a good fisherman. I have a job waiting for me in Montauk, New York, which is not too far from New York City. I have an address in New York City. And here I'm told from the first agent, you know, get ready, go fishing. Just get all the stuff you need. And when it changed to the next agent, he told me I wasn't allowed to go outside 15 miles of the state waters.

And I'm a commercial fisherman. I fish on federal permits inside of federal waters. And that's neither here nor there. I'm just speaking to the context of what I do for a living and how I provide for -- I have a daughter, you know. I'm not the greatest dad in the world, but I do help.

She lives in Texas, not California. And, you know, I help. I just don't have a lot of communication just because she's young, and right now it's more important to worry about school than worry about her dad who left when she was six,

because I was an immature person.

1.3

And I'm just trying to get home and see my family. I have some family. It's not much, but I don't have anybody here. And I'd just like to ask Your Honor to at least let me get home and show the Court that I can comply and do everything else that I did.

I didn't have any dirty urine samples. I complied with the mental health evaluation. I complied with the drug evaluation. I passed both of those, Your Honor. Wasn't required to go back to either of those.

I would just like, you know, an opportunity to show you my commitment, Your Honor. Thank you. I have nothing else to say.

THE COURT: Very well. I'll hear from the government.

MS. GORBEA PADRO: Your Honor, the government moves for the revocation of defendant's supervised release and that he be sentenced to the maximum statutory term of 24 months. This defendant has clearly shown no respect for the law. He wants to do things his way or no way at all. He has demonstrated poor judgment along the way, and his modus operandi has been taking advantage of people and wanting to take advantage of the system.

He's unable to follow instructions, Your Honor. And he's coming before this Court today not to admit his

wrongdoings and his failure to comply with his conditions of supervised release, but to give excuses and more excuses.

He's saying now before this Court there is a job waiting for him. Well, he should have done the right thing and he should have complied with the conditions of supervised release. Yet he's saying that there is a job waiting for him. But he informed the probation officer that he had to be on the move and unable to stay in one place.

So we really don't understand what is really going on with this defendant, Your Honor. If we go back to the beginning, after he was originally charged with sexually assaulting a minor, one of his conditions was that he had to register the place and address of residence whenever he was moving, or his job, address, et cetera.

He moved to Puerto Rico, and he did not comply with that first requirement. Then, back in June of this year, he was — the defendant reported that he had to relocate because of fear of being attacked by these individuals. And he reported to the probation officer that he had to be on the move and unable to stay in one place. And he failed back then to report his address of residence to the probation officer, which was one of his conditions of his supervised release, and one of the conditions under SORNA.

On that same day, on June 1st, 2018, he was instructed to report to the Probation Office, but he also

failed to do so. Then, in August of this year, another motion by the probation officer was filed that he once again failed to -- he was instructed to provide the address where he was staying, but he declined to do it. And he failed to report to the probation officer.

So, Your Honor, this is an individual who does not want to comply with the conditions, who does not want to report where he's at, who now he's saying that there's family waiting for him, but then again, he says that he's homeless, that he has no family.

So in essence, what the government is seeing is a very unstable individual who does not want to comply with the conditions of his supervised release, and he just wants to be on the run, on the run doing whatever he wants to do, which is making the wrong decisions, the wrong, bad judgments.

So Your Honor, this revocation, this revocation should be -- his conditions of supervised release should be revoked, and he should be sentenced to a term of 24 months. That is the government's position.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Your Honor, if I may reply briefly?

Your Honor, I heard sister counsel make her arguments, and I would argue that everything she just said is in favor of supervision, is in favor of the Probation Office getting deeper into the supervision with Mr. Gorman.

It's -- there's no -- there's no controversy that he's homeless. There's no controversy that he doesn't have a strong family background or support system. The threats in this case, there is no controversy to the extent that when the Probation Office interviewed the girlfriend, she confirmed that there were two guys asking for money to the extent she felt threatened herself and she filed a complaint.

And Your Honor, you heard him. You heard Mr. Gorman today. He's remorseful. He wants to comply. His re -- issues are relocating to the States, and the months that he was on supervision prior to leaving, he did so in a -- he complied basically. His violations in this case are because of particular circumstances that have been substantiated, Your Honor. They've been memorialized. And there's no controversy. That's the only reason we're here today, Your Honor, because of what he did back in June.

However, he stated to you just now, Your Honor, that he's committed to his supervision. He's committed to working with the Probation Office. And the only reason he left was because of these particular circumstances, Your Honor, because of this case and these particular circumstances, Your Honor.

And we cannot forget Mr. Gorman's background, Your Honor. A sentence of 24 months just won't -- it will not be justified, Your Honor. That's all we have to say.

MS. GORBEA PADRO: The government disagrees. If this

defendant would have complied, there wouldn't have been two motions filed by the probation officer notifying violations of his supervised release.

THE COURT: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HERNANDEZ GARCIA: I don't understand the argument.

THE COURT: One thing is clear here. The defendant has not complied with the conditions of supervised release as per motion of the probation officer. He has failed to report as instructed, to remain at the same address. Regardless, he has failed to follow the procedures that had been explained to him.

Even if he needed help or protection, he is well aware as well to -- even to relocate or transfer supervision, there's a process as well. It's not that the Court can come here and Order from now on he will be supervised in New York. There needs to be a request, and the District of New York needs to accept supervision.

It is also clear that this defendant may have mental conditions for which he needs treatment, and he's not receiving it. But, as well, there's evidence pointing to the fact that he tends to manipulate the system.

He has been lucky enough not to be charged with illegal possession of identification documents under two different names, which is separate violations, and had the

1.3

evidence been presented, would have been conduct that amounts to probably a felony offense, but would have increased the grade violation significantly, having the exposure of this defendant increased as well.

I think that listening to the defendant, I have to agree with the government. He keeps giving excuses. Though he says sorry, there's always an explanation and a scenario under which he puts and portrays things that have happened. But certainly the violations do stand. He has failed to register as well, which is a serious violation.

Sentencing the defendant to the maximum statutory penalty with no supervised release actually would be to just leave the defendant out there on his own and maybe not providing a good opportunity for rehabilitation. So I'll just impose -- a sentence that will reflect the seriousness of the offense would be at the higher end of the guidelines, but I will keep this defendant under supervision.

I find that he and the community as well are in need of those conditions of supervision, and both will benefit.

Defendant by receiving assistance that he needs for his rehabilitation, and the community will be protected from any further harm that could be caused by this defendant. And the defendant will have to register as required.

After having heard the parties in the case, the Court finds that Mr. James Francis Gorman has violated the

conditions of supervised release term by failing to comply with the conditions of supervised release that he was -- of the Sex Offender Registry and Notification Act, moving to an unapproved place, failing to notify new address to the probation officer, failing to report as instructed, and leaving the jurisdiction without authorization, and absconding after a warrant for arrest had been issued and awaiting for him to be arrested.

Accordingly, then the supervised release term imposed on September the 20th, 2017, is revoked. To impose sentence, I have considered Chapter Seven policy statements, including revocation of supervised release, and the dispositions under Section 7(B)(1.1)(a)(3). A grade C violation has been determined.

Based on a Criminal History Category of III, and a grade C violation, the Guideline Imprisonment Range is from five to 11 months pursuant to Sentencing Guideline Section 7(B)(1.4)(A). Pursuant to 3583(E)(3), upon revocation of supervised release, the Court may impose a sentence of supervised release for not more than two years since the original case at bar is a class C felony.

Mr. Gorman, has shown disregard complying with conditions imposed by the Court and also has failed to adhere to the supervision plan. The efforts made by the probation officer to assist him in compliance and provide some structure

have been fruitless. And therefore, the Court will consider the factors under Section 3553(a)(1)(2)(B)(C), and the nature and the circumstances and the financial scenario described herein, and the violations in which the defendant has incurred.

Considering all of that, the Court concludes that a sentence at the higher end of the guideline range is sufficient but not greater than necessary in this case. The defendant -- I'm asking counsel to, after the judgment, to explain what this means to the defendant.

I will keep him on supervised release for a significant period. And if you keep violating the conditions of release, the request from the government for two years prison sentence can come any time.

So according to the judgment of the Court, Mr. Gorman is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for 11 months. Upon release from confinement, he will serve eight years of supervised release under the following conditions.

The defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the court. He shall participate in an approved substance abuse monitoring and/or treatment services program.

The defendant shall refrain from unlawful use of controlled substances and submit to a drug test within 15 days

of release. Thereafter, submit to random drug testing. No less than three samples during the supervision period, and not to exceed 104 samples per year in accordance with the Drug Aftercare Program Policy of the Probation Office as approved by the Court.

If necessary, treatment will be arranged by the probation officer in consultation with the treatment provider. The defendant is required to contribute to the cost of services rendered in an amount arranged by the probation officer based on ability to pay or availability of third party payment.

Defendant shall not have contact with the victim of the prior sex offense and shall not engage in communication with the victim through mail, letters, telephone, computer, electronic devices, or third parties. The only exception relies in the incidental contact in normal commercial life.

The defendant shall provide the probation officer access to any financial information upon request, and he shall participate in a mental health treatment program for evaluation and/or treatment services as necessary. If deemed necessary, the treatment will be arranged by the officer in consultation with the treatment provider; the modality, duration, and intensity of treatment will be based on the risks and needs identified. The defendant will be required to contribute to the cost of services rendered by means of

co-payment based on his ability to pay or the availability of third-party payments.

The defendant shall submit to a search of his person, property, house, residence, vehicles, papers, computers, other electronic communication or data storage devices or media to a search at any time, with or without a warrant, by the probation officer, and if necessary, with the assistance of any other law enforcement officer if there is reasonable suspicion of unlawful conduct or a violation of a condition of supervised release.

The probation -- the defendant shall warn any other residents within the premises that the property will be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

The defendant shall comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registry and Notification Act as directed by the probation officer, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, or any state, U.S. Territory or Indian tribe, sex offender registration agency where he resides, works, is a student, carries on a vacation, or is employed, or was convicted of a qualifying offense.

The defendant shall undergo a sex offense specific evaluation and/or will participate in a sex offender treatment or mental health treatment program arranged by the probation officer. And the treatment will be arranged by the probation officer in consultation with the treatment provider; the

1.3

modality, duration and intensity of treatment will be based on the risks and needs identified by the probation officer and the experts in the field.

The defendant shall abide by all rules, requirements and conditions of the sex offender treatment program, including submission to testing, such as polygraph and/or any other testing available at the time of release.

Defendant shall waive his right of confidentiality in any records for mental health assessment and treatment services and shall sign any necessary release required to obtain those records that are imposed as a consequence of the judgment that will allow the probation officer to review defendant's course of treatment and progress with the treatment provider.

The defendant shall be required to submit to an initial polygraph examination and subsequent maintenance testing intervals to be determined by the Probation Office to assist in treatment planning, in case monitoring and as a means to ensure that he's in compliance with the requirements of his supervision program.

So that's the object and scope. The defendant will be required to contribute to the cost of services rendered based on co-payment based on his ability to pay or third party payment.

The defendant has been given notice he has 14 days

from entry of judgment in order to appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence.

And Mr. Gorman, let me say this. I have given you the benefit of a guideline sentence. And I could have construed reasons to go beyond that and given you a higher sentence.

Here you have complained about people who were stealing and not entitled to receive payment from you, but never reported those individuals. And you know what? You never paid your landlord. And you left the place in disarray even, with syringes and all that kind of stuff at the apartment you had and where you were living.

So I'm not taking that into consideration, and I have not taken it, but you have to understand that there's a -- the universal law of cause and effect. The way you behave towards others, others will start to behave. And contributing -- in the same fashion, you do well and you will receive well.

So this time you have received the benefit. I hope that you adjust and that you will comply with the conditions imposed. And remember the words of the government here. Next time around, probably the prosecutor won't be asking for the same type of penalties. You'll be facing harsher sentences, and God forbid, additional charges for any other conduct.

So anything else?

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor. Briefly, in

terms of designation, Your Honor, we would request that Mr. Gorman complete the remainder of his sentence at an institution in the New York City area. And that while at the institution, he receive mental treatment. And that the BOP comply with his kosher diet.

We request that, those Orders, Your Honor. Also, and finally, Your Honor, we would request an Order to probation regarding the potential address that we've informed earlier today.

THE COURT: What potential address?

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: There's an address in New York
City, with the purpose of seeing -- with the purpose of
transfer of supervision, Your Honor. We provided an address,
permanent address, the name of a person who lives at that
address. We gave it to probation about a month ago.

We would request an Order that the Probation Office look into that address and this person to the extent that --

THE COURT: Well, let me put it this way, and take it by stages. The recommendation for designation is granted. If the Bureau of Prisons can locate him in an area of New York, no problem at all.

In terms of instructing the probation officer, that will have to be done, I understand, with whoever works the release plan in New York. I don't know to what extent probation here will be submitting the collaterals, but there's

a process for that.

1.3

So whatever the process is, I think probation knows defendant's intent, request for transfer of supervision. I don't know where now he has to place that, whether it's with the case manager at BOP --

PROBATION OFFICER: (Nodding head up and down.)

THE COURT: Okay. They are telling me yes here, so I suggest you discuss that with the probation officer here after the conclusion of the session, and the defendant be guided, given advice as to how to proceed.

MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: I have the same understanding as you in terms of internal procedures, Your Honor. Probation officer informed me back in September that an Order from Your Honor was required. That's why I'm making the request. So —but we will inform Mr. Gorman to —

THE COURT: Let me ask the probation officer, what is it that I have to Order now at this juncture?

PROBATION OFFICER: Well, Your Honor, I think that the attorney was requested in July or -- that we, for -- we could request a relocation at that time, and we told the attorney that we needed first to complete the revocation proceedings and we look into that as part of the relief stage.

So he was trying to push us in that direction, but at that time he wanted us to do something with the revocation.

But we really had no -- the revocation proceeding was still

pending, so we still -- we needed to finalize this in order for us to know what route to go.

THE COURT: So as far as the concern, this is the way I see it. The defendant now goes to serve his sentence. At the time he's about to be released, he will be released to the district he was sentenced or where he lives, and then they work the plan. If supervision is transferred to New York, New York will ask a collateral from the Probation Office here. Then I will have to sign the paperwork. But the Judge out there has to accept before I sign those papers.

So once New York accepts, all they ask is for us to release him. I have no problem, but the procedures have to be followed. And the transfer does not materialize simply because I issue an Order. The supervising district has to accept. And they can decline.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HERNANDEZ GARCIA: We understand, Your Honor. But given there is an address and the name right now, and given that he --

THE COURT: I cannot Order it. I cannot Order it, even if there is an address. He will have to provide that address to the person that is working his release plan at the Bureau of Prisons. That's what I'm saying. I cannot Order his relocation.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ HERNANDEZ GARCIA: We understand that. I will make it clear to him, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Your Honor, in regard to the mental treatment and the kosher diet, did you --THE COURT: Well, the Bureau of Prisons is supposed to give every defendant the diet that is necessary. So to the extent he has a special diet, Bureau of Prisons is instructed to provide it to him, as well as the mental health evaluation and treatment if deemed necessary. MR. HERNANDEZ GARCIA: Nothing further on our part, Your Honor. Thank you. Have a good day. THE COURT: Very well. Court remains adjourned. (At 2:46 PM, proceedings concluded.)

```
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
     DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO)
 2
 3
          I certify that this transcript consisting of 37 pages is
 4
     a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability of
 5
     the proceedings in this case before the Honorable United
 6
 7
     States District Court Judge Aida M. Delgado Colon on October
     31, 2018.
 8
 9
10
11
12
     S/ Amy Walker
13
    Amy Walker, CSR 3799
14
     Official Court Reporter
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```